

**NPDES PERMIT NO. TX0127540**  
**STATEMENT OF BASIS**

FOR THE DRAFT NATIONAL POLLUTANT DISCHARGE ELIMINATION SYSTEM  
(NPDES) PERMIT TO DISCHARGE TO WATERS OF THE UNITED STATES

**I. APPLICANT:**

Golden Pass Pipeline Company, LLC  
17001 Northchase Dr, Suite 574  
Houston, TX 77060

**II. ISSUING OFFICE:**

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency  
Region 6  
1445 Ross Avenue  
Dallas, Texas 75202-2733

**III. PREPARED BY:**

Laurence E. Giglio  
Environmental Engineer  
NPDES Permits Branch (6WQ-PP)  
Water Quality Protection Division  
Voice: 214-665-6639  
Fax: 214-665-2191  
Email: giglio.larry@epa.gov

**IV. DATE PREPARED:**

August 10, 2007

**V. PERMIT ACTION:**

The Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) has made a tentative determination, after consultation with the Railroad Commission of Texas (RRC), to issue a first-time permit to the applicant for the activities described.

40 CFR CITATIONS: Unless otherwise stated, citations to 40 CFR refer to promulgated regulations listed at Title 40, Code of Federal Regulations, revised as of July 7, 2006.

FINAL DETERMINATION: The public notice describes the procedures for the formulation of final determinations.

## **VI. PROPOSED CHANGES FROM PREVIOUS PERMIT**

This permit is a first time issuance.

## **VII. APPLICANT ACTIVITY**

Under the Standard Industrial Classification (SIC) Code 4922, Natural Gas Transmission, the applicant proposes to conduct hydrostatic testing (HT) of 42" steel pipe, approximately 57-miles long. This project is the largest portion of an approximately 69-mile pipeline transporting gas from an onshore liquified natural gas facility located in Port Arthur Texas, and ending near Starks, Louisiana. The portion of the pipeline located in Louisiana will be permitted with the Louisiana Department of Environmental Quality.

This new construction pipeline was not in service prior to proposed HT activities, and is intended for natural gas transmission purposes only (as opposed to gas gathering purposes). HT water will contact only new pipe, and no chemicals will be added. As a result, no contaminants are expected to occur in the HT water discharge.

The HT will consist of two separate operations. Some sections, generally less than 1 mile each, of the pipeline need to be placed by means of horizontally directionally drilled (HDD) procedures. This procedure is used when the pipeline needs to traverse lakes, bayous etc. There are 16 such HDD sections, and these HDD sections will be pre-tested two times; the first time after its assembled and welded, but prior to being pulled through the horizontal boring and the second time after its pulled through the boring. The second type of HT will be longer sections of the pipeline after backfilling of the pipeline has been completed. These HT's will include some HDD's along with portions of the pipeline that was just trenched. The project has 6 test sections that comprise the Texas portion of the pipeline project.

Upon completion of the hydrostatic test, water may be pumped to the next pipeline segment for testing or discharged. Discharge piping will be connected to the test header and water will be discharged within the construction right-of-way through an energy-dissipating device. Test water will then flow into a straw-bale structure that will act as a filtering device. This filtering device will be in accordance with applicable permits and the erosion control plan. The test water would then be allowed to filter through well-vegetated areas to the receiving waters. In addition to minimizing the erosive potential of the test water, these measures will aerate the water and restore dissolved oxygen.

## **VIII. DISCHARGE LOCATION**

As described in the application, there are 16 HDD sections and 6 HT sections. The discharge points, showing the HT or HDD identifier, discharge coordinates; latitude and longitude, county, approximate HT or HDD pipeline segment length, estimated discharge volume in millions of gallons (MG), HT or HDD source water and the Texas Water Body Segment of the discharge point are shown in the following table. The pre-pull HDD's are denoted by HDD-PP, the after pull HDD's are denoted by HDD-AP notation. For the draft permit, the Outfalls listed will be for the HDD-AP locations.

Outfall Reference Number	Discharge Coordinates Latitude Deg° Min' Sec'' Longitude Deg° Min' Sec''	County	Length Miles	Discharge Volume MG	Receiving Water	Water Body Segment
001 HT 1	29° 52' 28.6" N 94° 04' 35.9" W	Jefferson	16.92	6.12	Taylor Bayou	0702
002 HT 2	29° 51' 55.5" N 94° 04' 21.4" W	Jefferson	3.88	1.40	Taylor Bayou	0704
003 HT 3	29° 55' 04.7" N 94° 04' 07.9" W	Jefferson	7.32	2.64	Hillebrandt Bayou	0704
004 HT 4	30° 01' 44.3" N 94° 01' 44.3" W	Jefferson	2.20	0.77	Neches River	0601
005 HT 5	30° 01' 44.3" N 94° 01' 44.3" W	Orange	9.65	3.49	Neches River	0601
006 HT 6	30° 07' 00.7" N 93° 54' 44.0" W	Orange	4.02	1.44	Cow Bayou	0601
007 HDD-PP 1	29° 45' 32.5" N 93° 56' 06.7" W	Jefferson	0.36	0.29	Keith Lake	0702
007 HDD-AP 1	29° 45' 30.0" N 93° 56' 29.7" W	Jefferson	0.36	0.29	Keith Lake	0702
008 HDD-PP 2	29° 46' 35.5" N 94° 01' 18.0" W	Jefferson	0.99	0.77	Intracoastal Waterway	0702
008 HDD-AP 2	29° 47' 27.5" N 94° 01' 07.4" W	Jefferson	0.99	0.77	Intracoastal Waterway	0702
009 HDD-PP 3	29° 51' 55.2" N 94° 04' 21.2" W	Jefferson	0.69	0.55	Taylor Bayou	0702
009 HDD-AP 3	29° 52' 28.6" N 94° 04' 35.9" W	Jefferson	0.69	0.55	Taylor Bayou	0702
010 HDD-PP 4	29° 52' 28.6" N 94° 04' 35.9" W	Jefferson	0.82	0.65	Taylor Bayou	0702
010 HDD-AP 4	29° 53' 55.1" N 94° 04' 39.7" W	Jefferson	0.82	0.65	Taylor Bayou	0702
011 HDD-PP 5	29° 54' 43.9" N 94° 04' 30.8" W	Jefferson	0.73	0.59	Hillebrandt Bayou	0704
011 HDD-AP 5	29° 55' 12.6" N 94° 03' 59.1" W	Jefferson	0.73	0.59	Hillebrandt Bayou	0704
012 HDD-PP 6	29° 59' 49.3" N 94° 03' 38.4" W	Jefferson	0.56	0.44	Johns Gully	0704
012 HDD-AP 6	29° 59' 49.3" N 94° 03' 38.4" W	Jefferson	0.56	0.44	Johns Gully	0704
013 HDD-PP 7	29° 59' 49.3" N 94° 03' 38.4" W	Jefferson	0.74	0.59	Johns Gully	0704
013 HDD-AP 7	29° 59' 49.3" N 94° 03' 38.4" W	Jefferson	0.74	0.59	Johns Gully	0704
014 HDD-PP 8	30° 00' 52.2" N 94° 03' 31.1" W	Jefferson	0.48	0.37	Port Arthur Canal	0601
014 HDD-AP 8	30° 00' 52.2" N 94° 03' 31.1" W	Jefferson	0.48	0.37	Port Arthur Canal	0601
015 HDD-PP 9	30° 01' 12.8" N 94° 03' 10.7" W	Jefferson	0.54	0.43	Port Arthur Canal	0601
015 HDD-AP 9	30° 01' 12.8" N 94° 03' 10.7" W	Jefferson	0.54	0.43	Port Arthur Canal	0601
016 HDD-PP 10	30° 01' 44.3" N 94° 01' 44.3" W	Jefferson	0.67	0.52	Neches River	0601
016 HDD-AP 10	30° 01' 44.3" N 94° 01' 44.3" W	Jefferson	0.67	0.52	Neches River	0601

017 HDD-PP 11	30° 02' 25.6" N 94° 00' 31.8" W	Orange	0.88	0.69	Neches River	0601
017 HDD-AP 11	30° 01' 44.3" N 94° 01' 44.3" W	Orange	0.88	0.69	Neches River	0601
018 HDD-PP 12	30° 02' 50.1" N 93° 59' 46.7" W	Orange	0.72	0.57	Anderson Gully	0601
018 HDD-AP 12	30° 02' 50.1" N 93° 59' 46.7" W	Orange	0.72	0.57	Anderson Gully	0601
019 HDD-PP 13	30° 07' 38.8" N 93° 54' 08.8" W	Orange	0.32	0.26	Cow Bayou	0501
019 HDD-AP 13	30° 07' 38.8" N 93° 54' 08.8" W	Orange	0.32	0.26	Cow Bayou	0501
020 HDD-PP 14	30° 08' 11.6" N 93° 53' 35.6" W	Orange	0.53	0.41	Cole Creek	0501
020 HDD-AP 14	30° 08' 11.6" N 93° 53' 35.6" W	Orange	0.53	0.41	Cole Creek	0501
021 HDD-PP 15	30° 08' 48.7" N 93° 52' 44.3" W	Orange	0.55	0.43	Cole Creek	0501
021 HDD-AP 15	30° 08' 48.7" N 93° 52' 44.3" W	Orange	0.55	0.43	Cole Creek	0501
022 HDD-PP 16	30° 10' 24.8" N 93° 50' 38.9" W	Orange	0.36	0.29	Adams Bayou	0501
022 HDD-AP 16	30° 10' 24.8" N 93° 50' 38.9" W	Orange	0.36	0.29	Adams Bayou	0501
023 HDD-PP 17	30° 15' 27.5" N 93° 43' 25.7" W	Newton	0.93	0.74	Sabine River	0501
023 HDD-AP 17	30° 15' 50.5" N 93° 43' 34.2" W	Newton	0.93	0.74	Sabine River	0501

Water Body Segment Code No.0702 is the Intracoastal Waterway Tidal of the Neches-Trinity Coastal Basin. Water Body Segment Code No.0704 is the Hillebrandt Bayou of the Neches River Basin. Water Body Segment Code No.0601 is the Neches River Tidal of the Neches River Basin. Water Body Segment Code No.0501 is the Sabine River Tidal of the Sabine River Basin.

## IX. STREAM STANDARDS

The general criteria and numerical criteria which make up the stream standards are provided in the Texas Administrative Code (TAC), 30 TAC Sections 307.1 - §307.10, effective April 30, 1997.

The discharge from Outfalls 001, 007, 008, 009 and 010 are into receiving waters in Water Body Segment Code No.0702, the Intracoastal Waterway Tidal of the Neches-Trinity Coastal Basin. The designated uses for Water Body Segment Codes 0702 are contact recreation and high aquatic life use. The pollutant pH is limited to 6.5-9.0 standard units (su's.)

The discharge from Outfalls 002, 003, 011, 012 and 013 are into receiving waters in Water Body Segment Code No.0704, the Hillebrandt Bayou of the Neches River Basin. The designated uses for Water Body Segment Codes 0704 are contact recreation and high aquatic life use. The pollutant pH is limited to 6.5-9.0 su's.

The discharge from Outfalls 004, 005, 006, 014, 015, 016, 017 and 018 are into receiving waters in Water Body Segment Code No.0601, the Neches River Tidal of the Neches River Basin. The

designated uses for Water Body Segment Codes 0601 are contact recreation and high aquatic life use. The pollutant pH is limited to 6.0-8.5 su's.

The discharge from Outfalls 019, 020, 021, 022 and 023 are into receiving waters in Water Body Segment Code No.0501, the Sabine River Tidal of the Sabine River Basin. The designated uses for Water Body Segment Codes 0501 are contact recreation and high aquatic life use. The pollutant pH is limited to 6.0-8.5 su's.

## **X. DISCHARGE DESCRIPTION**

This pipeline has not yet been completed; therefore there is no discharge to analyze.

## **XI. TENTATIVE DETERMINATION**

The Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) has made a tentative determination, after consultation with the Railroad Commission of Texas (RRC), to issue a first-time permit to the applicant for the activities described.

## **XII. DRAFT PERMIT RATIONALE**

The proposed effluent limitations for those pollutants proposed to be limited are based on regulations promulgated at 40 CFR 122.44. The draft permit limits are based on either technology-based effluent limits pursuant to 40 CFR 122.44(a), on best professional judgment (BPJ) in the absence of guidelines, and/or requirements pursuant to 40 CFR 122.44(d), whichever are more stringent.

### **A. REASON FOR PERMIT ISSUANCE**

An NPDES Application for a Permit to Discharge (Short Form C) was received on June 1, 2007, and was deemed administratively complete on August 8, 2007.

### **B. OPERATION AND REPORTING**

The permittee must submit Discharge Monitoring Report's (DMR's) quarterly, beginning on the effective date of the permit, lasting through the expiration date of the permit or termination of the permit, to report on all limitations and monitoring requirements in the permit.

### **C. TECHNOLOGY-BASED EFFLUENT LIMITATIONS/CONDITIONS**

Regulations promulgated at 40 CFR122.44 (a) require technology-based effluent limitations to be placed in NPDES permits based on effluent limitations guidelines (ELG's) where applicable, on BPJ in the absence of guidelines, or on a combination of the two. There are no published ELG's for this type of activity. Permit limits are proposed based on BPJ. Limitations for Oil & Grease, Total Suspended Solids (TSS), and pH are proposed in the permit. The proposed limitations for Oil & Grease is 15 mg/l maximum, TSS are 45 mg/l maximum, 30 mg/l average, and a pH range of 6.0 to 9.0 standard units. The draft permit will not propose mass limits since the flow is variable and intermittent. Concentration limits will be protective of the stream uses.

## D. WATER QUALITY SCREENING

### 1. General Comments

The Clean Water Act in Section 301 (b) requires that effluent limitations for point sources include any limitations necessary to meet water quality standards. Federal regulations found at 40 CFR 122.44(d) state that if a discharge poses the reasonable potential to cause an in-stream excursion above a water quality criterion, the permit must contain an effluent limit for that pollutant. If the discharge poses the reasonable potential to cause an in-stream violation of narrative standards, the permit must contain prohibitions to protect that standard. Additionally, the Texas Surface Water Quality Standards (TWQS) found at 30 TAC Chapter 307 states that "surface waters will not be toxic to man from ingestion of water, consumption of aquatic organisms, or contact with the skin, or to terrestrial or aquatic life." The methodology outlined in the "Implementation of the Texas Commission on Environmental Quality Standards via Permitting" (ITWQS) is designed to insure compliance with 30 TAC Chapter 307. Specifically, the methodology is designed to insure that no source will be allowed to discharge any wastewater which: (1) results in instream aquatic toxicity; (2) causes a violation of an applicable narrative or numerical state water quality standard; (3) results in the endangerment of a drinking water supply; or (4) results in aquatic bioaccumulation which threatens human health.

The following narrative limitations in the proposed permit represent protection of water quality:

"The effluent shall contain no visible film of oil or globules of grease on the surface or coat the banks or bottoms of the watercourse."

### 2. Reasonable Potential

EPA develops draft permits to comply with State WQS, and for consistency, attempts to follow the ITWQS where appropriate. However, EPA is bound by the State's WQS, not State guidance, including the ITWQS, in determining permit decisions. EPA performs its own technical and legal review for permit issuance, to assure compliance with all applicable State and Federal requirements, including State WQS, and makes its determination based on that review.

Waste load allocations (WLA's) are calculated using estimated effluent dilutions, criteria outlined in the TWQS, and partitioning coefficients for metals (when appropriate and designated in the implementation procedures). The WLA is the end-of-pipe effluent concentrations that can be discharged and still meet instream criteria after mixing with the receiving stream. From the WLA, a long term average (LTA) is calculated, for both chronic and acute toxicity, using a log normal probability distribution, a given coefficient of variation (0.6), and either a 90th or a 99th percentile confidence level. The 90th percentile confidence level is for discharges to rivers, freshwater streams and narrow tidal rivers with upstream flow data, and the 99th percentile confidence level is for the remainder of cases. For facilities that discharge into receiving streams that have human health standards, a separate LTA will be calculated. The implementation procedures for determining the human health LTA use a 99th percentile confidence level, along with a given coefficient of variation (0.6). The lowest of the calculated LTA; acute, chronic and/or human health, is used to calculate the daily average and daily maximum permit limits.

Procedures found in the ITWQS for determining significant potential are to compare the reported analytical data either from the DMR history and/or the application information, against percentages of the calculated daily average water quality-based effluent limitation. The more stringent of the calculated water quality based effluent limitations are compared against analytical data included with the permit application.

Procedures found in the ITWQS require review of the immediate receiving stream and effected downstream receiving waters. Further, if the discharge reaches a perennial stream or an intermittent stream with perennial pools within three-miles, chronic toxicity criteria apply at that confluence.

The applicant proposes to draw water from various sources; mostly stream, river or bayou water, but a few HT tests will use municipal water. This new construction pipeline was not in service prior to these tests, and is intended for natural gas transmission purposes only (as opposed to gas gathering purposes). The use of municipal water in those few HT tests poses a risk of chlorine in the water during discharge from those HT tests that use municipal water. Chlorine is a known toxicant at any measurable concentration, and for those HT tests that use municipal water total residual chlorine (TRC) shall be proposed in the draft permit. With the exception of HT tests using municipal water, new pipe, and no other chemicals outside of the previously mentioned chlorine residual, no toxics are expected in the discharge. With the exception of municipal source water for those limited HT tests, no other contaminants are expected to be present in the water discharge at amounts that would pose a reasonable potential to exceed State WQS.

### 3. Reasonable Potential-Calculations

#### a. pH

The limitation of pH for Outfalls 001, 002, 003 and 007 through 013 shall be limited to the range 6.5 to 9.0 su's. The limitation of pH for Outfalls 004, 005, 006 and 014 through 023 shall be limited to the range 6.0 to 8.5 su's.

#### b. Total Residual Chlorine

If any municipal or city water is used for HT at any outfall, then it shall be limited in the draft permit. TRC shall be limited to "no measurable" in outfalls that use municipal water; 007, 009, 020 and possibly 012, 013 and/or 015.

#### c. Narrative Limitations

Narrative protection for aesthetic standards will propose that surface waters shall be maintained so that oil, grease, or related residue will not produce a visible film or globules of grease on the surface or coat the banks or bottoms of the watercourse; or cause toxicity to man, aquatic life, or terrestrial life.

#### d. Discharge Flow Rate

The applicant has requested a discharge flow rate of approximately 4,000 gallons per minute (gpm), with the provision that it will be monitored to ensure that the discharged test water does

not overflow the dewatering structure or cause excessive erosion. EPA believes that in reviewing the discharge locations provided by the applicant, there are several outfalls where this rate would appear to be excessive given the topography, the water body and the potential to scour the waterbody. EPA has reviewed the locations, and Outfalls 003, 004, 005, 011, 016, 017 and 023 shall be authorized to discharge at the 4000 gpm rate (5.76 MGD) daily maximum. The remaining Outfalls however; 001, 002, 006, 007, 008, 009, 010, 012, 013, 014, 015, 018, 019, 020, 021 and 022 shall be limited in the permit to a daily maximum rate of 3.6 MGD, which is based on a 2500 gpm rate.

#### **E TECHNOLOGY BASED VERSUS WATER QUALITY STANDARDS BASED EFFLUENT LIMITATIONS AND CONDITIONS**

Following regulations promulgated at 40 CFR122.44(l)(2)(ii), 122.44(d), and 130.32(b)(6), the draft permit limits are based on either technology-based effluent limits pursuant to 40 CFR122.44(a), on the results of or on State Water Quality Standards and requirements pursuant to 40 CFR122.44(d), or on the results of an established and EPA approved Total Maximum Daily Load (TMDL), whichever are more stringent. These limitations are also found in TX0127515, an NPDES Permit that was recently issued for a similar type of discharge.

Numerical water quality based limitations have been placed in the permit for pH, TRC, Oil & Grease, and TSS.

#### **F. WHOLE EFFLUENT TOXICITY LIMITATIONS**

There are no chemical specific limitations in the draft permit and the applicant has stated that no chemical additives such as corrosion inhibitors are being added to the HT water. There does not appear that the discharge will have a potential for toxicity. The draft permit does not propose any biomonitoring of the HT water.

#### **G. FINAL EFFLUENT LIMITATIONS**

See the draft permit for limitations.

#### **H. MONITORING FREQUENCY**

Regulations require permits to establish monitoring requirements to yield data representative of the monitored activity 40 CFR 122.48(b) and to assure compliance with permit limitations 40 CFR 122.44(i)(1). The monitoring frequencies are based on BPJ, taking into account the nature of the discharge.

For ALL outfalls, monitoring for TSS, Oil & Grease, TRC, and pH shall be by grab sample daily, when discharging, and flow shall be estimated daily.

### **XIII. IMPAIRED WATER - 303(d) LIST AND TMDL**

This section discusses the potential impact on the State listed 303(d) impaired waterbodies by the proposed discharge. This discussion is in addition to the water quality screening process. Based on ambient data and effluent data available to the agency, if the discharge would have a



reasonable potential to cause or contribute to a violation of water quality standards, water quality-based effluent limitations would be established in the permit as discussed in the previous sub-section: Water Quality Screening.

The receiving stream for Outfall 002, Intracoastal Waterway, is on the State's currently approved 303(d) list as being impaired for bacteria with a category ranking of 5c. Category 5c indicates additional data will be collected prior to scheduling a TMDL. The receiving water for Outfalls 002 and 003, Hillebrandt Bayou, is on the State's currently approved 303(d) list as being impaired for depressed dissolved oxygen with a category ranking of 5a. Category 5a indicates that a TMDL is underway, scheduled, or will be scheduled. The receiving streams for Outfalls 019 through 023, Sabine River Tidal, is on the State's currently approved 303(d) list as being impaired for bacteria with a category ranking of 5c. Category 5c indicates additional data will be collected prior to scheduling a TMDL. None of the discharges have a reasonable expectation to depress dissolved oxygen and/or contribute to further bacteria impairment, and no additional permit requirements are needed as a result of these listings.

#### **XIV. ANTIDegradation**

The Texas Commission on Environmental Quality, Texas Surface Water Quality Standards, Antidegradation, Title 30, Part 1, Chapter 307, Rule §307.5 sets forth the requirements to protect designated uses through implementation of the State WQS. The limitations and monitoring requirements set forth in the proposed permit are developed from the State WQS and are protective of those designated uses. Furthermore, the policy sets forth the intent to protect the existing quality of those waters, whose quality exceeds their designated use. The permit requirements are protective of the assimilative capacity of the receiving waters, which is protective of the designated uses of that water.

#### **XV. ANTIBACKSLIDING**

The proposed permit is a first-time issuance.

#### **XVI. ENDANGERED SPECIES**

According to the most recent county listing available at US Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS), Southwest Region 2 website, <http://www.fws.gov/southwest/es/EndangeredSpecies/lists/>, six species in Jefferson County are listed as Endangered or Threatened. Two species in Newton County are listed as Endangered or Threatened. Since the bald eagle delisting, no species are listed for Orange County. The listed species for Jefferson County are the Green sea turtle *Chelonia mydas*, the Hawksbill sea turtle *Eretmochelys imbricata*, Kemp's ridley sea turtle *Lepidochelys kempii*, Leatherback sea turtle *Dermochelys coriacea*, Loggerhead sea turtle *Caretta caretta* and the Piping Plover *Charadrius melodus*. The listed species for Newton County are the Louisiana black bear *Ursus americanus luteolus* and the Red-cockaded woodpecker *Picoides borealis*. Based on the following discussion, EPA has determined that the issuance of this permit will have *no effect* on these federally listed threatened or endangered species.

Research of available material finds that the primary cause of the turtles threats are destruction of nesting sites and man-made alteration of riverine and beach habitat changes. Habitat alteration

and destruction are the primary causes for the decline of the Piping Plover. Loss of sandy beaches and lakeshores due to recreational, residential, and commercial development has reduced available habitat on the Gulf of Mexico. For the Red-cockaded woodpecker this was a decrease in the quality and quantity of old growth pine forest nesting habitat, primarily due to short rotation (harvest cycle) timber management. For the Louisiana black bear this was the loss of den sites which are spatially arranged across sufficiently large, relatively remote blocks of lands. The short-term nature of the project will not cause any loss of habitat or alteration of potential habitat for the listed species.

## **XVII. CERTIFICATION**

The permit is in the process of certification by the Railroad Commission of Texas following regulations promulgated at 40 CFR 124.53. A draft permit and draft public notice will be sent to the District Engineer, Corps of Engineers; to the Regional Director of the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and to the National Marine Fisheries Service prior to the publication of that notice.

## **XVIII. ADMINISTRATIVE RECORD**

The following information was used to develop the proposed permit:

### **A. APPLICATION**

NPDES Application for Permit to Discharge (Short Form C) dated June 1, 2007.

### **B. REFERENCES**

The State of Texas Water Quality Inventory, 13th Edition, Publication No. SFR-50, Texas Commission on Environmental Quality, December 1996.

"Implementation of the Texas Commission on Environmental Quality Standards via Permitting," Texas Commission on Environmental Quality, August 1995.

Texas Surface Water Quality Standards, 30 TAC Sections 307.1 - 307.10 (21 TexReg 9765, April 30, 1997).

### **C. 40 CFR CITATIONS**

Sections 122, 124, 125, 133, and 136

NPDES Permit TX0127515, issued on 1/26/07, effective February 1, 2007, and expires January 31, 2012.

### **D. MISCELLANEOUS CORRESPONDENCE**

E-mails from Helen Shumway, at AMEC Paragon, contractor to Golden Pass Pipeline LLC, to Larry Giglio, EPA, August 113 and 14, 2007, regarding maximum discharge rates.